



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/496,990	02/02/2000	Man Pak Yip	081862.P173	6948

7590 10/23/2002

Thinh V Nguyen
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

QURESHI, SHABANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/496,990

Applicant(s)

YIP ET AL.

Examiner

Shabana Qureshi

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Terms such as ECR, utility factor, transport device speed, queue depth are not defined to illustrate the functionality of the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al (U.S. 5,917,804).

As per claim 1, Shah et al teach an apparatus to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al

Art Unit: 2155

employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 2 Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 3, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 4, Shah et al teaches the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

As per claim 5, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 4, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 6-11, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 5. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claim 12, Kinnunen teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 13, Shah et al teach a method to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's invention, such as: an ECR

Art Unit: 2155

based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 14, Shah et al teach the method of claim 13, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 15, Shah et al teach the method of claim 14, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 16, Shah et al teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 17, Shah et al teach the method of claim 16, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 18-23, Shah et al teach the method of claim 17. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 24, Kinnunen teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 25, Shah et al teach a computer program product to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the computer program product comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the

Art Unit: 2155

applicant's invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 26, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 25, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 27, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 26, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 28, Shah et al teaches the computer program product of claim 26, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

As per claim 29, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 30-35, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 29. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 36, Kinnunen teaches the computer program product of claim 25, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 37, Shah et al teach a system interfacing a network with connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's

Art Unit: 2155

invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 38, Shah et al teach the system of claim 37, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 39, Shah et al teach the system of claim 38, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 40, Shah et al teaches the system of claim 38, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 41, Shah et al teach the system of claim 40, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 42-47, Shah et al teach the system of claim 41. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 48, Kinnunen teaches the system of claim 37, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

Art Unit: 2155

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

SQ
October 18, 2002


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100